

Paul Newman

THE EFFERENTIAL (ALIAS 'CAUSATIVE') IN HAUSA*

1. Introduction

The so-called 'causative' verbal derivation in Hausa has long been described semantically as such. Bargery (1934:xxxii), for example, explicitly adopted the label 'causative' for this derivation in his general taxonomy of Hausa verb forms: "Causative verbs ... e.g. *nā sayar da doki* , 'I sold the horse' (caused the horse to be bought); *nā sanar da Audu* , 'I informed Audu' (caused (it) to be known by Audu)." Abraham, who in his works (e.g. 1959:68; 1962:xxiii) refers to these as 'causal verbs', follows Bargery's analysis and paraphrases. Gouffé (1962), in a major study of this verb form, rejects the passive interpretation found in the Bargery/Abraham analysis, but adheres to the semantic characterization of this form as being essentially factitive/causative. This is clear from Gouffé's own statements and from the supposed literal translations he presents with his examples, e.g. "*naa sanad dā sarkii lāabaarūn* 'j'ai appris la nouvelle au chef' (littéralement 'J'ai fait connaître au chef la nouvelle')" (p.190); *naa šaa* (= *šayad*) *dā dookii (ruwaa)* 'j'ai fait boire (de l'eau) au cheval, j'ai abreuvé le cheval'" (p.187). In Newman (1973), where an attempt

was made to find descriptively appropriate labels for all of the Hausa derivative verb forms (= 'grades' 4, 5, 6, and 7 in Parsons's (1960) system), I unhesitatingly chose the well-established term 'causative' to apply to grade 5. Bagari, a native Hausa speaker, concurs in the standard description: "Grade 5 verbs are usually called 'causative' grade verbs because their meaning almost always implies causation" (1977a:2).

Not surprisingly the generally accepted scholarly viewpoint on causatives has been incorporated in modern pedagogical grammars. Kraft and Kirk-Greene (1973): "Often a causative meaning ... sayar, sell (lit. cause to buy)" (p.147); "The meaning is usually causative, though other, less predictable, meanings frequently occur" (p.238). Cowan and Schuh (1976:260): "Causative verbs. These causatives can usually be roughly translated 'cause to do' the action of the basic verb. shayar dà 'cause to drink'." Jungraithmayr and Möhlig (1976:141): "Der Veranlassungs- oder Kausativstamm ... sáni: 'wissen', sán-às/är 'wissen machen, lassen, informieren'; sayà: 'kaufen', sây-às/är 'verkaufen (kaufen machen)'."

There is a notable exception to the mainstream viewpoint on Hausa causatives, namely Parsons. In a detailed response to Gouffé (1962), Parsons (1962) explicitly questions the accuracy of semantically characterizing the grade 5 form as involving causation. His reservations on this matter are shown implicitly in other works (e.g. 1971/72) by his practice of placing the term 'causative' in quotation marks and by his referring to it as the 'so-called causative'. For reasons that are not entirely clear, Parsons's thoughts about the semantic value of the 'causative' form have on the whole been ignored and have not affected the standardly accepted understanding of what the Hausa causative represents.

In this paper I argue that the characterization of the Hausa grade 5 as a 'causative' is totally inaccurate and without justification. I suggest, moreover, that the term 'causative' - whether taken literally or with reservations - is highly misleading, not only to the Hausa descriptivist, but also to the Afroasiatic comparativist and universal typologist. I, therefore, propose to replace 'causative' for the Hausa grade

5 by the more accurate and terminologically superior neologism 'Efferential' (derived from Latin *efferre* 'to carry away').

2. Morphological Preliminaries

Parsons (1960) classifies Hausa verb stems into seven 'grades', each with its distinctive morphological shape(s). In some grades the stem is invariant; in others, it exhibits alternations depending on syntactic context. For example, the gr. 1 stem *kaɸántà* 'read' has the form /*kaɸántà*/ before a noun direct object, but /*kaɸántaa*/ elsewhere; while the gr. 2 stem *sáyì* 'buy' appears as /*sáyì*/ before a noun direct object, /*sáyee*/ before a pronoun direct object, and /*sáyaa*/ when occurring without an object¹.

The so-called causative is numbered gr. 5, a designation that I shall use for referring to this *morphological* class without prejudice as to its meaning. Unlike the other grades, gr. 5 exhibits considerable morphological variation, both internally and dialectally, which makes it difficult for the reader to recognize that different surface forms are all manifestations of this same grade. For purposes of this paper - which is conceptual and not phonological/morphological in nature - I offer the following simplified morphological sketch. (For fuller details, see Bagari 1977a, Gouffé 1962, Newman 1973, and Parsons 1962, 1971/72.)

The neutral form of a gr. 5 verb, which can be taken as the citation form, has all high tones and a suffix -aɸ, e.g. *zubaɸ* 'pour away'; *kawaitaɸ* 'silence s.o.'. Monosyllabic CV verbs insert an epenthetic /y/ between the root and the suffix, e.g. *ciyaɸ* 'feed' (< ci 'eat'), *shaayaɸ* 'give water to' (< shaa 'drink'). In some dialects, the suffix is -as, e.g. *zubas* = *zubaɸ*, the historically earlier form from which -aɸ is derived.

Before direct objects, the above form is used plus the particle *dà* (presumably the same as the preposition *dà* 'with'). The semantic direct object is morphosyntactically really an object of a preposition, e.g. *yaa zubaɸ dà ruwaa* 'he poured out the water', *yaa ciyaɸ dà 'ita* 'he fed her' (where 'ita is an absolute pronoun required after a preposition and not a direct object pronoun). The final -C of the gr. 5 suffix commonly assimilates to the initial /d/ of the particle, i.e. *zubad dà* =

zubař/zubas dā. If a noun indirect object intervenes, the dā may be omitted (see Parsons 1962 for details), e.g. yaa ciyař wā 'abookinsā kāree 'he fed the dog for his friend'. Rare nowadays in Standard Hausa, but still documented, are cases where the dā is omitted even when the gr. 5 is followed immediately by a direct object, e.g. (examples from Abraham 1957:158) yaa baayan ni (< baayař ni) 'he betrayed me' (lit. gave me away); yaa hawam mu (= yaa hawař dā muu) 'he mounted us (on horse-back)'. Note that if the dā is omitted, the verb takes a true direct object pronoun rather than an absolute pronoun².

In addition to the standard pre-object forms zubař dā, etc., certain verbs (mostly CV(V) verbs or CVCV verbs with a light first syllable) have a corresponding 'short form' without the -ař suffix, e.g. zub dā = zubař dā, shaa dā = shaayař dā, fid dā = fitař dā 'take out'. In northern and western dialects (NW), the dā with the short form variant behaves as a suffix fused to the verb stem, as contrasted with standard Hausa (SH) where it functions as an independent particle. This can be seen in the lengthening of dā before pronoun objects and in the paradigmatic pronoun set employed, e.g. (NW) yaa fiddāa ta = (SH) yaa fid dā 'ita 'he took it out'. The fused nature of the dā also shows up in the possibility of derivation and inflection built on the full stem composed of root + dā, e.g. yaa fiddoo sū 'he brought them out' (gr. 6 of fiddā < fit + dā); yanāa saiduwaa 'it is sellable' (progressive participle of gr. 7 of saidā 'sell' < sāyi 'buy' + dā). In relating these NW forms, termed 'décausative' by Gouffé (1962), to the SH short form gr. 5's, it has generally been assumed that the dā has been incorporated into the stem by a historical fusion process. As first suggested in Newman (1971), it is more likely that the 'décausatives' represent the historically earlier form and that the SH short form gr. 5's resulted from reanalysis and reinterpretation. Historically speaking the dā in zubbā and the dā in zubař dā are unrelated, their identity being simply due to accidental homophony. It thus appears that the single gr. 5 as we now know it includes two etymologically unrelated suffixes: -as (which syntactically came to require the preposition dā before direct objects) and -dā. The suffix -dā can be traced back to a Proto-Chadic extension *dā (or perhaps *-dā); where -as

comes from and how it originally differed in meaning and function from -dā remains an unanswered question.

The last variant of gr. 5 that needs to be mentioned is the so-called -shee form that occurs before pronoun direct objects, e.g. *naa zubshee shi* 'I poured it out', *yaa ciishee tā* 'he fed her', *yaa fissanee su* ([fiššee] < fitšee) 'he took them out'. As explained in Newman (1973), this -shee is not a special aberrant form, but rather is a surface palatalized variant of the normal gr. 5 suffix -as, the full form of which was probably originally *-asi (cf. Bagari 1977a). The pronoun form following -shee is a bound direct object pronoun (see Newman 1979), cf. *yaa ciishee tā* with the equivalent *yaa ciyad dā* 'ita.

3. Incorrectness of the Traditional Analysis

The characterization of gr. 5 as a 'causative', although commonly repeated, has never been justified by evidence of any sort, whether direct semantic, pragmatic, or textual/discourse. Instead, all that one finds in the literature are causative paraphrases, e.g. 'I informed the chief' = 'I caused the chief to know', which have no independent justification other than the conclusory interpretation that one is questioning. In fact, there is almost no evidence to support the 'causative' interpretation and considerable evidence against it. The incorrectness of the causative interpretation can be seen both by looking carefully at Hausa itself and by looking at the Hausa derivational form in relation to observed cross-language properties of causatives.

3.1. Internal analysis

A weakness of the oft-repeated causative paraphrases of gr. 5 forms is that they are totally inapplicable to a large number (perhaps a majority) of verbs that occur in this form. Moreover, even in the cases where the paraphrases at first seem plausible, they are inconsistent with contextual expansions or alterations. For example, the gr. 5 form in *yaa jeefad dā maashii* 'he threw away his spear' does not lend itself to a causative interpretation that could be related in any plausible way to the basic verb *jēfi* 'throw at' (e.g. *yaa jēfi gafiyāa dā maashii* 'he threw a spear at the bandicoot' (lit. he threw at the bandicoot with a spear)). As pointed out by Parsons

1962), non-causative gr. 5 verbs such as jeefaɸ, zubaɸ 'pour away', tuuraɸ 'push away', etc. constitute a large class and cannot be disposed of as merely exceptions to a general causative meaning. In a clause such as yaa shaa dā dookii 'he watered/gave water to the horse', the paraphrase 'he caused the horse to drink' might seem reasonable at first sight, but definitely less so in the context of a succeeding clause ... 'ammaa yaa kī shaā '... but he (the horse) refused to drink'. The potential for an inanimate subject of the verb shaayaɸ also points up a further weakness in the causative paraphrase, e.g. riijjiyannān taa shaa dā gārimmū 'This well waters our town' (not *... causes our town to drink).

As is well known, Hausa has another means of expressing causation apart from gr. 5. This is by use of the verb saā 'to put, to cause' followed by a simple direct object or by an embedded clause, e.g. sarkii yaa saā sū yi rawaa 'The chief made them dance' (lit. The-chief put that-they do dance). Inexplicably, apart from Bagari (1977b), this syntactic causative has not been discussed in relation to the morphological gr. 5 'causative' derivation. When directly comparing the two constructions, however, the inadequacy of the gr. 5 paraphrases and the non-causative nature of gr. 5 is thrown into focus³. Compare, for example, the following two sentences employing the verb fita 'go out': yaa saā taa fita 'he made her go out'; yaa fitad dā 'ita (gaawaa) 'he removed it (the corpse)'. While the first sentence is a true causative, one would be loathe (except perhaps in a Frankenstein film) to interpret the second sentence as meaning 'he made it (the corpse) go out'. Since the gr. 5 derivation and the syntactic causative have different meanings and functions, they are freely combinable, e.g. yaa saā taa fitad dā gaawaa 'he made her remove the corpse'. Note similarly the difference between yaa saā maalām yaa ci naaman kāree 'he made the malam eat dog meat' and yaa ciyad dā baayii naaman kāree 'he fed the slaves dog meat' (this perhaps being their favorite dish!); or taa saā yaa sāyi Mercedes 'she made him buy a Mercedes' vs. yaa sai dā VW 'he sold a VW (cf. taa saā yaa sai dā VW yā sāyi Mercedes 'she made him sell the VW and buy a Mercedes').

3.2. Typological analysis

Comrie (1976) has described a number of cross-language similarities in the use and expression of causatives. Taking just two of the more pervasive and typical properties of causatives the Hausa gr. 5 is strikingly out of step. One could of course argue that Hausa shows that the universal claims are wrong or that Hausa simply constitutes an exception to the rule; but given the inadequate basis upon which gr. 5 was termed 'causative' in the first place, its deviation from typical causative patterns constitutes significant evidence in support of the contention that gr. 5 is really not a causative.

3.2.1. Generally speaking, causative constructions are highly productive (subject to idiosyncratic lexical restrictions). "More specifically, no matter how many arguments a given non-causative verb has, there will also be an equivalent causative verb with one more argument" (Comrie 1976:264). In Hausa, however, gr. 5 is extremely rare (see Parsons 1962:260). There are numerous 1-place intransitive verbs that lack a corresponding 2-place gr. 5 verb and numerous 2-place transitive verbs that lack a corresponding 3-place transitive verb. Thus one has *tsima* 'soak, steep' (v.i.), but not **tsimaF* 'soak sth., cause to steep', and *daakusa* (more usually *daakūshee*) 'become blunt, dull', but not **daakusaF* 'blunt, make dull'. Such verbs do have transitive counterparts, but not in gr. 5 (see below, sec.

4.2.2). Most regular transitive verbs do not have a corresponding gr. 5 form even though, as shown by the existence of the syntactic *saa* causative, there is no semantic reason why the gr. 5 should not occur if it truly were a causative. Thus, *taa ginā tūuluu* 'she built a pot' allows a corresponding *yaa saa taa ginā tūuluu* 'he caused her to make a pot', but not **yaa ginadā* 'ita tūuluu. Similarly, one gets *yaa saa naa fubūuta takāfdaa* 'he made me write a letter', but not **yaa fubūutadā* *nii takāfdaa*. Note that the verb *kařanta* 'read, study' does have a gr. 5 counterpart meaning 'teach, educate', e.g. *yaa kařantadā* 'almāajifai' 'he taught the children (to read)'. If the common paraphrase of *kařantaF* as 'cause to read' were correct, which it is not, there would be no plausible explanation for the absence of **fubūutaF* 'cause to write'.

In the case of transitive verbs that do allow gr. 5, it is clear that the derivational form has nothing to do with adding a third argument to the argument structure. In fact, gr. 5 forms are seldom used with more than two arguments; if one wants to express three arguments the normal means with most verbs is to use a gr. 1 Applicative rather than a gr. 5, e.g.

yaa s̄ayi dookii	he bought a horse	(basic 2-place)
yaa sayad dā dookii	he sold a horse	(gr. 5, 2-place)
yaa sayda masā dookii	he sold him a horse	(gr. 1, 3-place)
naa 'āri littaaḥii	I borrowed a book	(basic 2-place)
naa 'arad dā littaaḥii	I lent a book	(gr. 5, 2-place)
naa 'arda wā yaarḥo	I lent the boy a	(gr.1, 3-place).
littaaḥii	book	

Instructive here is the irregular verb baa 'give', which normally requires three arguments unless one eliminates the need for one by use of gr. 5!

For example,

yaa baa nī kudii	he gave me money	(basic 3-place)
yaa baayad dā kudii	he gave away money	(gr. 5, 2-place).

3.2.2. With causatives of transitive verbs, the normal pattern is for the embedded subject to function as an indirect object in derived structure (Comrie 1976:268). For example, if a sentence such as 'The dog ate food' were embedded as object of a sentence 'I caused...', the word 'dog' in the resulting sentence 'I fed (= caused to eat) the dog food' would be expected to show up as an indirect object. In Hausa, this is not the case. When three primary arguments occur with a gr. 5 verb - as indicated above, this is disfavored - the presumed embedded subject in the causative analysis appears as a direct object, not as an indirect object, the result being double direct objects, e.g. yaa ciishee sū 'ābinci 'he fed them food'; zaata kooyad dā dāalibai fillancii 'she will teach the students Fulfulde'; naa ganad dā 'ita fōotoo 'I showed her the photograph'. When an indirect object does occur with a gr. 5 verb, it represents a dative (or benefactive) and not an underlying subject, cf. the following examples taken from Gouffé (1962:140): naa hawar wā 'Audū dāakinsā 'I raised a roof on the house for Audu' (Audu is i.o.), not *'I caused Audu to mount the room';

cf. naa hawar/hau dā 'Audu dookii 'I mounted Audu on a horse' (Audu is d.o.).

A careful look at the Hausa gr. 5 in relation to cross-language properties of causatives cannot help but raise suspicions about the correctness of the causative analysis. When one adds to this the failure of the causative interpretation to provide a descriptively adequate account of the meaning and use (including non-use) of gr. 5 verbs, it becomes evident that the traditional approach is fundamentally wrong and must be rejected. The analysis that I am offering in its place is subsumed under the label 'Efferential'.

4. Efferential

Parsons (1962:268) noted that with verbs such as jeefaɓ 'throw away' a causative meaning was not possible, as contrasted with verbs such as kooyaɓ 'teach'. "But", he went on, "the real semantic significance is the same in both cases, viz. *disposal* or *riddance*" (emphasis his). Parsons almost had the right answer, but not quite. With the help of insights gained by looking at verbal extensions in other Chadic languages, one can be more exact: the Hausa gr. 5 is essentially a *directional* derivational extension indicating Action Away. Like extensions in other Chadic languages, the Hausa Efferential has a related grammatical function alongside its essential semantic one, namely transitivizing inherently intransitive verbs, e.g. fita 'go out', fitaɓ 'take out'. Note that the relationship between the two verbs is a direct one (like English sit/set, lie/lay) and does not depend on any abstract notion of causation. The Efferential merely serves to reverse the direction of the action, so that what originally affects the subject in the 1-place intransitive verb emanates from the subject to the object in the related 2-place verb. For convenience in exposition, I shall first illustrate the Efferential with transitive verbs, indicating Action Away, and then with intransitive verbs, functioning as a Transitivizer.

4.1. Action Away

Unlike the extension sometimes termed 'itive' or 'andative' or 'egressive' in other African languages, the Efferential in-

dicates not so much motion away as *action* directed out and away. With some verbs the extension carries a literal meaning (e.g. 'throw/throw away'), whereas with others the same basic meaning appears in a less literal fashion (e.g. 'learn/teach'). In either case, conceptually the same semantic element is involved and one really has a continuum rather than a dichotomy between the most 'literal' and most 'figurative' senses. The listing of examples here in two subcategories is simply for convenience of presentation. (Examples are illustrative, not comprehensive.)

(a) Action Away in literal directional sense:

	Basic meaning	Efferential (gr. 5)
tuurá	push	push away
jéefi	throw at	throw away
wuŋǵá	throw	throw away
(*yaa	throw)	throw away (yaa/yaf dá)
kifé(e)	invert	jolt out
zubá	pour	pour out
háFbi	shoot, kick	kick off, reject
būgi	beat, hit	knock over
kāari	screen	ward off
rabá	divide, distribute	distribute (to others), divorce
baa	give	give away, betray
'āuri	marry	marry off
bāaRūnci	be guest of	be made stranger

A sentence such as yaa 'aurad dá 'yaa tasá translates directly into English as 'He married off his daughter'. In neither language is a causative paraphrase 'He caused his daughter to marry' necessary or correct. (The Dutch pair *huwen* /*afhuwen* 'marry/marry off' provides even a better morphological parallel with Hausa 'āuri/'auraf.)

The difference between rabá and the gr. 5 rabaf is shown neatly in examples provided by Bagari (1977b:70), who points out that in 'Audu yaa rabad dá 'ābinci 'Audu divided out the food', Audu could not have given himself a share - notice here the riddance/disposal idea - whereas in 'Audu yaa rabá 'ābinci there would be no implication that he was excluded.

Bargery (1934:67) provides an example of a gr. 5 which beautifully captures the essential semantics of the Efferential: 'an baakuntad dā shii 'he has been expelled from the town and made a stranger in another place' (where baakuntāf < bāakūnci 'be the guest of' < the noun bāakoo 'guest, stranger').

(b) Action Away in the sense that the effect or impact of the action is shifted away from the subject to the object:

	Basic Meaning	Efferential (gr. 5)
'āri	borrow	lend
rānci	borrow (money)	lend
gāaji (j < d)	inherit	bequeath
kōoyi	learn	teach
kafāntā	read, study	teach
sāami	get	supply
sāadu	meet, reach	deliver
sāyi	buy	sell
sāari	buy in bulk	sell in bulk
fānshi	buy (Koran)	sell (Koran)
san (< sāni)	know	inform
gaanē(e)	understand	explain
fāhimci	understand	explain
gāyi	say	greet
ga(nii)	see	show
tunā	remember	remind
bi	follow	lead
ci	eat	feed
shaa	drink	give water to.

The correct paraphrase for sayaf 'sell' is *not* 'cause to buy', as has been repeated over the past forty years, but rather 'buy away' (cf. Dutch kopen 'buy', verkopen 'sell'). Collateral evidence for this interpretation can be found in Turkana, a Nilotic language of northern Kenya (data from Dimmendaal 1982). Although Turkana does have a true morphological causative, the 'buy/sell' pair does not show up there, but rather with the 'itive' (motion or action away) extension, e.g. -gyel 'buy', agyelārɔ 'sell'; -dɛm 'take', adɛmarɔ 'take away'; -buk 'pour', abukorɔ 'pour out'; cf. -duk 'build', akituduk 'make build'; -lep 'milk', akitelep 'cause to milk'; -yar

'live', akiteyar 'save'.

There are admittedly some gr. 5 verbs that translate easiest using a causative type of phraseology, cf. yaa ji daadii 'he felt happy' vs. yaa jii dà nii daadii 'it made me happy'. I would suggest, nevertheless, that the semantic relationship between ji and jiyaf is the same as that between ci and ciyaf (i.e. Efferential) and that one is still not really dealing with causation.

While gr. 5 usually adds a semantically identifiable efferential meaning, with some verbs (especially denominatives and other derived stems) the gr. 5 formation is semantically empty (see Parsons 1971/72:77n). In these cases the gr. 5 and another form (usually gr. 1) constitute doublets, where the gr. 5 is perhaps stylistically fancier, e.g.

toofā	= gr. 5	spit
buukā	= gr. 5	throw to ground
rikītā	= gr. 5	tangle, muddle up
tsoorātā	= gr. 5	frighten
Raayātā	= gr. 5	beautify.

4.2. Transitivity

4.2.1. In addition to its semantic work, the Efferential has the grammatical function of changing intransitive into transitive verbs (see Frajzyngier 1977). Contrary to the analysis in Newman (1971), which viewed transitivity in Chadic strictly as a syntactic phenomenon, I would now hold that for many Chadic languages (Hausa definitely being one of them) transitivity is also a lexical property of individual verbs. A verb such as fita 'go out', for example, is inherently intransitive and thus has to undergo morphological derivation to become transitive (fitaf). Conversely, a verb such as gasā 'roast' is inherently transitive and has to be 'passivized' into gr. 7 (gāsu) to become intransitive (see Jaggar 1981). One of the derivational means by which an intransitive in Hausa is changed into a transitive is by the use of the Efferential (gr. 5). Note in such cases that the NP which is added in going from a 1-place verb to a 2-place verb is a direct object, i.e.

NP₁ VP_{intr.} ==> NP₁ V+Efferential NP₂

e.g.

yaaróo yaa fita ==> yaaróo yaa fitaǎ dá kaayaa
The boy went out. ==> The boy took out the goods.

It should be emphasized that transitivizing involves direct morphological/lexical derivation and does not involve complex sentence reduction or semantic causation as implied by the common paraphrases such as 'he caused the goods to go out'. Some of the transitivizing examples also exhibit an element of away/riddance/disposal (or other non-predictable semantic nuances), but this is not essential.

(a) Transitivizer

	Basic meaning	Efferential (gr. 5)
baaci	spoil	spoil sth.
batá	get lost	lose, spend, squander
difa	jump down	bang down
faadi	fall	drop, throw down
fafkáa	wake up	awaken s.o.
fita	go out	take out
gáji	become tired	tire, bore
gúffaana	kneel	bring to one's knees
hákurá	be patient	enjoin patience on
huutáa	rest	pension off, sack
kau (=káwa)	move aside	put aside, remove
káwaitá	be silent	reduce to silence
koomáa	return	return sth.
kaara	cry, complain	cry out, disseminate
mayáa	return	return sth.
raabáa	hide	conceal
(*ráwa)	sway)	shake sth.
sáuka	get down	lift down, bring down
shiga	enter	take in, insert
(*taa)	rise)	raise
táfi	go	run, administer
tsayáa	stop	stop sth.
tsiira	escape	save, rescue
warkée	get well	cure
zaunáa	sit	set down.

While gr. 5 verbs are almost always transitive, a few intransitive gr. 5's do occur. In these cases, the addition of the derivational ending either adds an Efferential nuance or else simply creates a stylistic doublet, e.g. sooroo yaa zubaF 'The roof is sloping' (i.e. 'spills away') < zuba 'leak, spill' (v.i.), cf. zubaF (dā) 'pour away, throw away' < zuba 'pour sth.' (v.t.); māganda taa rikitaF 'The matter is puzzling' = ... rikitā (gr. 3, v.i.), cf. rikitaF (dā) 'tangle, muddle up sth.' = rikitā gr. 1, v.t.).

4.2.2. A major function of the Efferential extension is to alter 1-place intransitive verbs into 2-place transitive verbs. This extension, however, is not the only one that performs this task. With many (perhaps most) intransitive verbs, the grammatical change is effected by adding the Applicative extension (see Newman 1973, 1977a), i.e. by turning the verb into a gr. 1 form, e.g.

Basic verb		Applicative (gr. 1)	
cika	be filled	cikā	fill sth.
dāllasā	become blunt	dallāsā	blunt sth.
diga	drip	digā	pour out in drops
jika	get wet	jikā	moisten, make wet
kāntarā	be crooked, bent	kantārā	bend sth.
tāfasā	boil (v.i.)	tafāsā	boil sth.
tsima	soak, steep	tsimā	soak, steep sth.
zuba	spill, leak	zubā	pour.

Having pointed out the two different means of transitivizing, the question is how to specify which verbs employ which extension. The answer is that the verbs which transitivize by adding the Efferential (gr. 5) are essentially Action verbs with an animate subject, whereas the verbs that transitivize by adding the Applicative (gr. 1) are essentially Process verbs with an inanimate subject. (See Chafe 1970:95-104 for an analysis of verb classification in these terms, with which I have taken certain liberties.) Put another way, the intransitives that use the Efferential in changing from a 1-place verb into a 2-place verb do so by adding a direct object, e.g. yaarōo yaa bātā 'The boy is lost' ==> yaarōo yaa bād dā kudii 'The boy squandered the money'; zañ tsayāa nañ 'I shall stay/stop here'

==> zañ tsai dà mootaa 'I shall stop the car'. With the intransitives that use the Applicative, on the other hand, the change from 1-place to 2-place is accomplished by adding a new (usually animate) subject and by demoting the original subject to direct object, e.g. tūluu yaa cika 'The pot filled' ==> yaarinyāa taa cikā tūluu 'The girl filled the pot'; 'āyābā taa nukā 'The bananas ripened' ==> mun nukā 'āyābā 'We ripened (by storing) the bananas'.

5. Efferential in Comparative Chadic Perspective

Whereas the gr. 5 -as suffix is without parallels elsewhere in Chadic, the -dā suffix can be related to similar forms in other languages, all presumably derived from a Proto-Chadic form *dā. Although the occurring forms have been described and labelled in disparate ways, their differences can be reconciled and cognation established by using the general Efferential concept. The purpose of the following sketch is to provide a Chadic background against which the characterization of Hausa presented in this paper can be placed. I shall begin with languages most closely related to Hausa (indexed I.A.1) and then proceed further afield (see Newman 1977b for the Chadic classification employed).

In Karekare [I.A.2] (M.Schuh, n.d.), there is an extension /t-/, which functions almost exclusively as a transitivizer, e.g. nzābū 'fall', nzābtū 'throw down'; dēnū 'become warm', dēntū 'warm up sth.'; gērū 'wake up', gērbātū 'awaken s.o.'; nzārāa 'drip', nzārāatū 'pour away'. A few verbs, however, suggest that the extension may earlier have also connoted action away; thus one finds rākātū = rākū 'drive away', where the reconstructed root is *raku (cognate with Hausa 'aiki 'send') and dēbātū 'sell', where the /t-/ suffix must have been frozen to the root before the original word for 'buy' was replaced by the now occurring jānāa. (Cf. Ron-Bokkos dif 'buy', dif...yā 'sell', where yā is an Efferential/Exhaustive particle, e.g. shu 'pour', shu...yā 'pour away' (examples from Jungraithmayr 1970:120).)

The situation in Bole [I.A.2] is similar. Although Lukas (1971:3) labels the Bole /t-/ suffix 'Die Kausative Erweiterung', there is no semantic justification therefor. As in

Karekare it is simply a transitivizer, e.g. *ɗánú* 'be saved', *ɗántú* 'save, rescue', *yáwwú* 'get down', *yáutú* 'take down', *ɗyóru* 'stop', *ɗyórtú* 'stop sth.', *dáaru* 'get well', *dáarítú* 'cure'. In one example only (taken from personal field notes from the Gadam dialect) is action away manifested: *isi yi kuti* (ga gusho) 'he threw at the dog (with a stone)' vs. *isi yaatu gusho* 'he threw away the stone' (cf. the defective Hausa gr. 5 verb *yaa dá* 'throw away (one thing)').

Ngizim [I.B.1] (R.Schuh 1972:29-31) has a morpheme *-dú* (alternating with *-náa* in specific environments) which converts basic intransitive verbs into transitive verbs, e.g. *Kwaana áa kalakta* 'Kwana will return' vs. *Kwaana áa kalakta-du* 'Kwana will return (it)'. The morpheme does not indicate action away. Schuh correctly avoids the term 'causative' in favor of the more accurate term 'Transitizer'.

A look at Bade (a language belonging to the same language/dialect cluster as Ngizim) is instructive when considering the Hausa extension *-dá* in relation to the preposition *dá* 'with'. Although the Bade extension *-dɛ* and the preposition *dɛ* have the same shape, they behave differently in context, thereby showing them to be distinct, albeit homophonous, morphemes, e.g. (< R. Schuh, field notes), *aci ji dɛ-k amɛn* 'he went with water' (prep.) vs. *aci ji d(ɛ) amɛn* 'he took water' (extension).

In Pa'a [I.B.2] (Skinner 1979:130-32), the extension labeled 'causative' has the form *-ei* (with variants /e/ and /ey/), e.g. *ná mba* 'he went out', *ná mbe dla* 'he took the boy out'. Since the change **t/*d > y* is attested in the Warji group, to which Pa'a belongs, this extension could well be cognate with Ngizim *-dú*. From the examples presented, it seems that this extension serves solely as a transitivizer and has no true causative (or action away) meanings.

Turning to the Biu-Mandara branch, Gisiga [II.A.5] (Lukas 1970:69-70) has an extension *dɛ* (alternating with *d(ɛ)*), which, notwithstanding its designation as 'causative', can be seen to be primarily a transitivizer. Although Lukas writes the morpheme as if it were a separate particle, it is probably better viewed as the last occurring affix in the complex expanded verb.

(As in other Biu-Mandara languages, the expanded verb includes pronominal objects as well as extensions and plural markers.)

Examples;

me	return	'i mē-de	I returned (it)
b-o	come out	b-o-de	Take it out!
s-o	come	'i s-aŋ-də le	I brought him (aŋ = him)
cf. 'i s-o-də duu ta			I didn't bring corn (duu = corn)
s-ok-oo-də kumaaŋi			(You pl.) bring a shirt!

The extension *de* can apparently occur with a few transitive verbs, but in these cases it appears to be semantically empty, e.g. 'i ra tsən-aŋ = 'i ra tsən-aŋ-de 'I hear him'.

In Kotoko [II.B.1], **də* as a productive extension no longer exists. However, there are two examples that I have come across that attest to its former presence (examples from Goulfeï dialect, personal field notes): hāl 'burn' (v.i.), hāldə 'burn sth.'; yīŋ 'know', yīŋdə 'know how, be able'.

In the Kapsiki dialect of Higi [II.A.3] (Hoffmann 1966), the presumably cognate extension *-mtə* has as its primary meaning 'action away'. Although *-mtə* serves to transitivize inherently intransitive roots, this cannot be deemed a distinctive function since all extended verb stems in Higi are transitive, regardless of which extension is added. Examples: fī 'rub', fīmtə 'rub off'; kələ 'take (one thing)', kələmtə 'take away (one thing)'; bətə 'pour', bətəmtə 'pour away'; pā 'buy', pāmtə 'sell'; pē 'bathe, take a bath' (v.i.), pēmtə 'wash off/away' (v.t.).

The second major meaning of *-mtə* is to indicate that the object is consumed or used up completely in the action, e.g. tā 'cook', tāmtə 'use up in cooking'; sərə 'fry', sərəmtə 'fry up' (e.g. all the meat).

This Higi extension can be compared directly with the extension *-na* in Margi [II.A.2], which Hoffmann (1963:132) describes as follows: "The suffix *-na* mainly seems to indicate that the action is done in the direction 'away' or results in some kind of separation, removal, or even destruction ... Intransitive simple stems usually become transitive (causative [sic]) in this derivative form ..." Examples include ndāl 'throw', ndālŋā 'throw away'; dāl 'buy', dālŋā 'sell'; ngyə

'burn' (v.i.), *ngyēnā* 'burn sth'.

To my knowledge there is only one Chadic language (out of the approximately 150 that exist) that has what appears to be a real causative extension. The language is Bachama [II-A.8] (Carnochan 1970:91), and the extension is *-dē*, e.g.⁴ *nda dāmē* 'he went out', *nda dāmde nzei* 'he took the boy out' or 'he caused the boy to go out'; *nda bwāa* 'he became tired', *lyēntē a bwāadē Pwēddēn* 'The work made Pwēddon tired'; *nda ngēl nzei* 'He pulled the boy', *nda ngēldē nzei sālākei* 'He made the boy pull the rope'.

Whereas many Bachama examples could be interpreted simply in terms of a transitivizer, others (e.g. the last presented above) indicate that Bachama cannot be forced into the more common Chadic pattern. Rather, it seems that Bachama has innovated in expanding the use of its extension to include a true causative function. A detailed study of the causative in Bachama would be extremely useful in highlighting the difference between a Causative and an Efferential, and in coming to an understanding as to how one can develop out of the other.

The comparative evidence presented above suggests that Proto-Chadic had an Efferential verbal extension **dē* and that this extension combined the two elements Action Away and Transitivizer that one still finds in Hausa. In some present-day languages (e.g. Ngizim), the extension has lost one of its original functions; in others (e.g. Higi and Bachama), the extension has shifted and expanded its semantic range in one manner or another. But, given the Efferential concept, the system in all the present-day languages can be historically related in a natural way.

6. The Efferential Among Hausa Secondary Grades

In the usual approach to Hausa verbs, the various grades are viewed as *morphologically* part of a total system, but semantically independent and unrelated. However, once gr. 5 is reinterpreted NOT as a 'causative *grade*' - a unique Hausa phenomenon - but rather as a particular Hausa manifestation of a Chadic 'Efferential' *extension*, it is possible to reformulate the grade system in different terms. What we have indicated about the Efferential is typical of all Chadic extensions,

namely that they all tend to have two components: (1) a directional meaning and (2) a related grammatical/notional function. When we look closely at the Hausa verb system in these terms, we find that this double-component feature of gr. 5 can also be ascribed to the other derived grades. Consider the following table, where a new, integrated conceptualization of the Hausa secondary grades is offered:

<u>Grade no.</u>	<u>Label</u>	<u>Meaning and Function</u>	
		Directional	Notional/Grammatical
gr. 1	Applicative ⁵	on	applicative/transitivizer
gr. 4	Totality	up	exhaustive
gr. 5	Efferential	away	transitivizer
gr. 6	Ventive	hither	benefactive
gr. 7	Sustentative	down	well done/intransitivizer

7. Conclusion

In this paper I have demonstrated that the so-called 'Causative' in Hausa is not a causative at all. Rather, Hausa has a verbal extension, for which I introduce the term 'Efferential', that (1) indicates action away and (2) serves to transitivize inherently intransitive action verbs. Evidence from other Chadic languages indicates that Proto-Chadic had an Efferential extension (*də), to which the Hausa extension exhibits a direct relationship both in form and substance. Finally, it is suggested that all of the derived grades in Hausa can be reanalyzed as Chadic-like extensions, each containing a directional and a notional/grammatical component.

Notes

*Research for this paper was supported by a National Science Foundation grant no. BNS77-16841 awarded to the Center for Applied Linguistics.

I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Maxine Schuh, Russel Schuh, and Roxana Ma Newman in the preparation of this paper.

1. In the Hausa examples, a long vowel is indicated by double letters and low tone by a grave accent. High tone is left unmarked. The symbol \bar{r} represents a rolled r , which contrasts with r , an apical flap. Consistent with the analysis in Newman (1973), I am using the pre-noun direct object form as the citation form of grade 1 and grade 2 verbs.
2. In Newman (1979), I argue that direct object pronouns in Hausa do not have polar tone as generally asserted. The high tone pronoun here immediately following the all high tone grade 5 verb provides another good example of a non-affixal direct object pronoun with inherently high tone.
3. Since Bagari was unable to free himself from his starting assumption, namely that gr. 5 verbs were causative, he was forced to rely on incredible ingenuity and theoretical linguistic gymnastics in order to explain the differences that he himself had pointed out so well between these "two kinds of causatives".
4. In transcribing the Bachama examples, I have replaced Carnochan's /o/ by /ə/, his /u/ by /ʊ/, and his /ey/ by /ei/.
5. Grade 1, which constitutes a single morphological class in Parsons's system, really contains two distinct classes: (1) basic non-derived verbs ending in -a such as gasà 'roast' and haɓà 'dig', which are not under discussion here, and (2) Applicatives (see Newman 1973).

References

- Abraham, R.C., 1959: *The Language of the Hausa People*. London: Univ. Press.
- , 1962: *Dictionary of the Hausa Language*. 2nd ed. London. Univ. Press.
- Bagari, Dauda, 1977a: Reanalyzing the Hausa causative morpheme; in: *Papers in Chadic Linguistics*, eds. Paul Newman and Roxana Ma Newman, 1-11. Leiden: Afrika-Studiecentrum.
- , 1977b: Causatives in Hausa; in: *Harsunan Nijeriya* 7:61-74.
- Bargery, G.P., 1934: *A Hausa-English Dictionary*. London: OUP.
- Carmochan, Jack, 1970: Categories of the verbal piece in Bachama; in: *ALS* 11:81-112.
- Chafe, Wallace L., 1970: *Meaning and the Structure of Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Comrie, Bernard, 1976: The syntax of causative constructions: cross-language similarities and divergences; in: *The Grammar of Causative Constructions (Syntax and Semantics, 6.)*, ed. M. Shibatani, 261-312. New York: Academic Press.
- Cowan, J. Ronayne, and Russell G. Schuh, 1976: *Spoken Hausa*. Ithaca, NY: Spoken Language Services.
- Dimmendaal, Gerrit J., 1982: *The Turkana Language*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leiden.
- Frajsyngier, Zygmunt, 1977: On the intransitive copy pronoun in Chadic; in: *SAL Suppl.* 7:73-84.
- Gouffé, Claude, 1962: Observations sur le degré causatif dans un parler haoussa du Niger; in: *JAL* 1:182-200.
- Hoffmann, Carl, 1963: *A Grammar of the Margi Language*. London: OUP.
- , 1966: Simple and extended verb stems in Kapsiki. Paper presented at the 6th West African Language Congress (Yaoundé). Unpubl. ms.
- Jaggar, Philip J., 1981: Some unusual lexical passives in Hausa. M.A. thesis, UCLA.
- Jungraithmayr, H., 1970: *Die Ron-Sprachen: Tschadohamitische Studien in Nordnigerien*. Afrikanistische Forschungen, 3. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin.
- Jungraithmayr, H., and W.J.G. Möhlig, 1976: *Einführung in die Hausa-Sprache*. MSAA, A, 7. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

- Kraft, C.H., and A.H.M. Kirk-Greene, 1973: Hausa. (Teach Yourself Books.) London: The English Universities Press.
- Lukas, Johannes, 1970: Studien zur Sprache der Gisiga (Nordkamerun). Afrikanistische Forschungen, 4. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin.
- , 1971: Über das erweiterte Verb im Bolanci (Nordnigerien); in: Special Chadic Issue, ed. P. Newman, 1-14. JAL 10(1).
- Newman, Paul, 1971: Transitive and intransitive in Chadic languages; in: Afrikanische Sprachen und Kulturen - Ein Querschnitt (Festschrift J. Lukas), eds. V. Six et al., 188-200. Hamburger Beiträge zur Afrika-Kunde, 14. Hamburg.
- , 1973: Grades, vowel-tone classes and extensions in the Hausa verbal system; in: SAL 4:297-346.
- , 1977a: Chadic extensions and pre-dative verb forms in Hausa; in: SAL 8:275-297.
- , 1977b: Chadic classification and reconstructions; in: AAL 5(1):1-42.
- , 1979: The historical development of medial /ee/ and /oo/ in Hausa; in: JALL 1:173-188.
- Parsons, F.W., 1960: The verbal system in Hausa; in: AuÜ 44: 1-36.
- , 1962: Further observations on the 'causative' grade of the verb in Hausa; in: JAL 1:253-72.
- , 1971/72: Suppletion and neutralization in the verbal system of Hausa; in: AuÜ 55:49-97, 188-208.
- Schuh, Maxine (n.d.): Karekare vocabulary. Unpubl. ms.
- Schuh, Russell G., 1972: Aspects of Ngizim Syntax. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Skinner, Margaret G., 1979: Aspects of Pa'anci Grammar. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin.